

From: [Susan Beasley](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE03123_planning objections
Date: 16 November 2015 11:27:26

34, Old Lane,

Bramhope,

Leeds LS16 9AZ.

11.11. 2015.

LDF Publication Draft Consultation,
Forward planning and implementation,
The Leonardo Building,
2, Rossington Street,
Leeds, LS2 8HD

Dear Leeds city council, Site HG2 – 17 (1080 and 3367A)

I would like to object to the planning application for site HG2 – 17 (1080 and 3367A)

The site allocation plan is unsound. Site HG2 – 15 (3400) is not a correct site for a housing development on the following grounds:

- 1. The proposed plan for 74,000 properties is too high.** According to the 2011 census Leeds has not grown in population as anticipated. Therefore, current planning is too high. Although there are 35,000 more new jobs in Leeds half the people filling these positions do not live in Leeds. Therefore, a more **appropriate target would be 66,000 properties.** This target **could be met through the use of existing brown field sites.**
- 2. LCC has a policy of “brown field sites first” This is not a brown field site. LCC has not explained why they can’t build the proposed number of properties on brown field sites within Leeds.**
- 3. LCC has not provided substantive reasons for proposing to build on green belt.** According to government guidelines, there should be no inappropriate development harmful to greenbelt. The proposed development would destroy greenbelt.
- 4. There are plans to take some land out of greenbelt and reassign it as green field land. This action does not comply with any of the government reasons to come out of green belt. LCC has not justified the intention to remove some of the land from greenbelt and reassign the categorization “green field”.**
- 5. The site is not sustainable.** There is **no infrastructure in place** to address an increment in population of the proposed magnitude. A figure of almost 400 new homes could increase the population by approximately 2000 individuals. The local primary school and health care facilities within the village are already full to capacity. Although there is a provisional plan to include a new school within the build, it is unclear who would fund the construction or running of such an establishment. Health care would have to be provided

elsewhere. Furthermore, as there are no employment prospects locally and one new convenience store would be unable to meet shopping requirements; new residents would be forced to go further afield to meet daily needs.

6. Building up to 376 new homes would place **intolerable pressure on the environment**. The scale of pollution from the new build would be untold. Three hundred and seventy six new homes would equate to around 1000 additional cars pouring fumes into the local environment.

7. The A660 would be unable to cope with the increased volume of traffic. The A660 already has the highest level of congestion of all major routes into Leeds. The extra volume of traffic, to add to the chaos already operating at peak times would be overwhelming. A flood of commuters, plus those engaged in school runs, would erupt each weekday morning and evening putting intolerable strain on the road network. **The A660 cannot accommodate the increase in traffic volume which would be an inevitable consequence of the development of site HG2 – 17 (1080 and 3367A).**

In summary the proposal to build on site HG – 2 (1080 and 3367A) is neither justifiable nor sustainable. Therefore, I would ask that the plan is rejected. Please do not destroy the British countryside for future generations. Alternative brown field sites within Leeds should be utilized instead.

Regards,

Sue Beasley